

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 2-4 and 16-18 are cancelled and claims 1, 5, 15, and 20 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 5-15, and 19-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,966,555, in view of Salgado, U.S. Patent No. 6,504,621. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

As to claims 3, 8-14, and 17 Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nakajima discloses a copying machine having an image reader which reads documents. A necessary number of sheets of each document is calculated, and compared to the remaining number of sheets in the copying machine. Nakajima does not disclose a print driver configured to evaluate the resource requirements of the print job, configured to compare the resource requirements to known available resources, or configured to respond to a resource deficiency exposed by the comparison, by communicating the print job to a printer with a command to hold the print job. In fact, Nakajima does not disclose a print driver at all.

Salgado discloses a system for managing resource deficient jobs in a multifunctional printing system. A workstation 82 with an emitter or driver 84 transmits a print job to a controller 44 in network service module 14. Network service module 14 manages the print job and holds it in a print queue table if it is a resource deficient job. Salgado does not disclose a print driver configured to evaluate the resource requirements of the print job, configured to compare the resource requirements to known available resources, or configured to respond to a resource deficiency exposed by the comparison, by communicating the print job to a printer with a command to hold the print job. Salgado only discloses that the driver transfers the print job to controller 44.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 8 includes wording that a print driver is configured to evaluate the resource requirements of a print job, the print

driver is further configured to compare the resource requirements to known available resources, and the print driver is further configured to respond to a resource deficiency exposed by the comparison, by communicating the print job to a printer with a command to hold the print job. Neither Nakajima nor Salgado discloses a print driver configured to carry out these actions.

Additionally, neither Nakajima nor Salgado disclose responsive to a resource deficiency exposed by a comparison, printing instructions, onto print media, for remedying the resource deficiency.

Nakajima discloses that an operator may be notified when the paper in a copying machine is empty when a document is read by the image reader. This does not imply that the document read by the image reader is printed instructions for remedying a resource deficiency. It merely explains the timing of the notification to the operator. The operator is notified when a document is read. Nakajima does not anywhere disclose that instructions for remedying a resource deficiency may be printed onto print media in response to a resource deficiency.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1 and 15, as amended to include wording from dependent claims 3 and 17, respectively, include wording that responsive to a resource deficiency exposed by a comparison, instructions are printed, onto print media, for remedying the resource deficiency. Neither Nakajima nor Salgado discloses printing instructions, onto print media, for remedying a resource deficiency.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
James S. Boyce

By   
Mark G. Pannell  
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 07/22/2004  
(719) 260-7900